

drugs; and yet they cost less in Canada than if he bought them here in the United States. He is saving 50 percent on the prescription drugs he is buying from Canada. If he bought them through AARP on a discount card, it would be 10 percent. So he still saves more by going directly to Canada.

The pharmaceutical industry has been fighting day and night to stop reimportation of pharmaceuticals. They have gone to the FDA and HHS, and they have told them it is not safe to have reimportation; and our health agencies have been going along with it. And yet we held four hearings, and we asked them to give one example where people have been harmed by pharmaceuticals brought in from Canada. They could not name one example. So the pharmaceutical industry has unusual support at our health agencies. They have undue influence at our health agencies; and as a result, American people are paying exorbitant prices for prescription drugs compared to what they are paying in Canada, Germany, and other parts of the world.

Just recently there was a poll that was released by the Associated Press and stated that a third of American families struggle to afford their prescriptions, and 73 percent of those families have to cut their dosages by as much as half so they can take care of their health needs. Two-thirds of those polled felt that the Federal Government should open up this market and make it easier for people to buy prescription drugs from Canada and other countries at lower cost.

So why does our government not listen to the people we represent? There is no safety issue. That is a bogus argument. Yet the health agencies continue to walk in lock-step with the pharmaceutical companies saying it is a health risk, and it is simply about money. The big profits they make in the United States are huge compared to what they are making in other countries. We continue to let them do that when the price they charge should be fair and equitable throughout the world. All of their profits should not be loaded on the backs of the American people who are struggling to make ends meet.

In July of this year, we had a vote on this floor. The vote overwhelmingly passed saying that we wanted the reimportation of pharmaceuticals to be allowed so Americans can get the breaks that they are getting in other countries. Even though that passed, when the Medicare prescription drug bill came out of conference committee, they left that out.

The other thing that bothers me is the American people realize that our government should be negotiating to make sure that Medicare prescription drug prices are as low as possible, and yet there is a prohibition in law passed by the Congress of the United States that does not allow our government under the Medicare prescription drug bill to negotiate with the pharma-

ceutical companies to get the best price for the American taxpayers. So we pay the highest prices for pharmaceuticals that the pharmaceutical companies want to charge, while in other countries there are negotiations taking place between their governments and the pharmaceutical industry. This just is not right. This is something my colleagues on both sides of the aisle feel very, very strongly about.

Mr. Speaker, we have to take our health agencies and anybody else to task who is trying to load all of the profits of pharmaceuticals on the backs of the American people. The American people need fairness; they need to know that they are going to be treated fairly. They should not have to cut their pharmaceutical products in half in order to stretch them out to take care of their health needs. They do not want to pay up to 300 percent more than they are paying in Canada for the pharmaceuticals products, and they should not be called criminals because they go across the Canadian border and buy the very same product up there for less than they can get it here in the United States.

In addition, governors of 25 States and a multitude of cities across the country are now trying to negotiate with Canadian pharmaceutical distributors to buy their pharmaceutical products through Canada because they will save so much money, and it will help their budgets at the State and local level. This is a problem that is not going to go away. The pharmaceutical industry and our health agencies need to address this problem; and, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be quiet on this floor until this problem is solved.

#### JOBS RECESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, after 3 years in the White House, President Bush still has not figured out how to create jobs for Americans here in the United States. The economy has yet to grow to the point where companies feel confident in hiring new employees. Accordingly, millions of Americans remain unemployed, some for so long they have actually given up their job search. If the jobs recession does not end soon and the economy does not create 2.1 million jobs this year, then President Bush will be the first President since President Hoover to preside over an economy in which he did not create one net job.

One of the major reasons for the current jobs recession is the increased exporting of high-paying white- and blue-collar jobs overseas. Fortunately, this phenomenon has not hit New Jersey as hard as States like Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, and Georgia. However, New Jersey has still suffered.

I want Members to consider several examples from the township of Edison

in my congressional district. This week a Ford plant is scheduled to close, leaving more than 900 New Jersey employees without jobs. Last year, the Frigidaire air conditioning plant closed in Edison and shifted production to Brazil, leaving 1,600 people unemployed.

One would think that the Bush administration would be concerned about these job losses. Two weeks ago, however, we learned President Bush and his economic advisers view the movement of American factory jobs and white-collar work to other families as a positive transformation that will in the end enrich our economy.

The President's chief economist, Gregory Mankiw, made national headlines earlier this month when he said, "Outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past, and that is a good thing." President Bush supported this view in his annual economic report in which he wrote, "When a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than make it or provide it domestically here in the United States."

It is no wonder the President thinks our economic forecast is so rosy. He is not concerned about creating jobs here in the United States; sending jobs overseas is fine with him. How can we have an economic success if we send jobs overseas, but do not create enough new jobs with comparable wages here in the United States? It is clear the President and his economic team are not concerned about that at all.

These statements from President Bush and his economic advisers are particularly worrisome after Congress narrowly approved legislation last year that would give the President free rein to negotiate trade agreements with foreign governments without the ability of Congress to amend the agreements.

I opposed the so-called fast track trading negotiation authority because I was concerned the Bush administration would use it to sacrifice American jobs for cheaper imports. In an attempt to further expand international free trade, the administration is now in the process of negotiating an agreement between the United States and Central America that could potentially begin another exodus of American jobs to the south.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that such agreements will do nothing to create jobs here in the United States, and perhaps that is why President Bush and some of his leading economic advisers are backing away from another statement in that same annual economic report of the President in which the administration predicted 2.6 million jobs would be created this year. Just 1 week after the release of the report, both Treasury Secretary John Snow and Commerce Secretary Donald Evans refused to embrace President Bush's own economic projections because they know that is not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the Bush administration realizes shipping jobs overseas and cutting taxes for the wealthy elite in our country will not create jobs. President Bush and congressional Republicans have had 3 years to turn this jobs recession around. They have totally failed. It is time for Congress to pass measures that will encourage companies to keep jobs here in the United States. It is time we level the playing field and protect American jobs here, rather than continuing to export them overseas.

#### SECURITY FENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am so sick and tired of listening to the whining about this fence and walls in Israel. First, when I heard the complaining about the wall in Israel, I wondered whether they were complaining about the wall around Jerusalem itself. Walls and fences in the Middle East are as historic as the land itself.

I was just in Germany, and in pretty much every city they have a castle or a walled fort. That is true all over Europe, Austria, and other places. Walls and fences have been there historically, and they were not to keep people from leaving. They were to keep people from getting in. They were built in areas where there were disputed territories, or they would not have needed a wall if people were not going to attack them.

In Rome, we see all sorts of walls in different parts of the Roman Empire. It is a historic tradition in Europe. And, of course, there is the Great Wall of China that goes for thousands of miles and is fairly famous. When we look at our own country, let us say the border with Mexico where we have a fence that goes along the border with Mexico, or let us say gated neighborhoods in the United States, are we suddenly going to ban gated neighborhoods? Is the rule when we want to put a fence around our yard or security system at our house in order to keep people from intruding, are we going to say suddenly we need to unlock our doors and we can put no fences up in our own yards? It is the same basic principle of security and the right to protect your property and the people that live in it that is leading to all this whining about the fence in Israel.

Furthermore, some would add that it is disputed territory. The fact that somebody else has designs on the territory does not mean that you cannot put up a fence. Let us take our border with Mexico. There are some in the country of Mexico that believe that us getting California through a war where we had a clear overt pressure was kind of controversial, not to mention the Gadsden Purchase where we more or less forced Mexico to sell us Arizona and New Mexico, or where we pushed settlers into Texas and Texas declared

their independence and we did a fast recognition to bring Texas in. There are many Mexicans who do not believe that border is legitimate, but does that mean we do not have a right as a Nation, since we recognize those States, we freely associate and recognize them that way, that we do not have a right to put a fence there to protect ourselves from terrorists, illegal immigrants or drugs? Of course we have that right; and so does Israel have that right.

Since September 2000, Palestinian terrorists have launched more than 18,000 attacks, killing more than 800 Israelis and wounding 5,600. Such a high number of attacks seem inconsistent with the Palestinian Authority's commitment under the Oslo Accords and Road Map to curb terrorist activities. Without a true partner in peace, Israel alone has been left to defend itself.

One of the best methods of protecting the citizens of Israel is a security fence. In the last 3 years, not one of the 122 homicide bombers that killed 454 people in Israel infiltrated from Gaza. Gaza is separated from Israel by a security fence.

Despite this, there has been outrage and wide criticism when they have tried to put a fence at the West Bank. This case, which has now been taken to the court in front of the United Nations, is clearly within Israel's domestic jurisdiction, which demands that a government protects its citizens.

Highlighting this necessity was a bombing of a Jerusalem bus that just killed eight and injured 60. This homicide bombing occurred just before the international court began hearing the case against the fence. The need for additional security and the need for the fence in Israel has never been more clear. I am sick and tired of the whining and hypocrisy of many around the world who have built their own fences, built their own walls for thousands of years, and now want to stop Israel from defending itself.

Shortly after achieving independence in 1948, the newly formed State of Israel was set upon by its Arab neighbors. Despite an overwhelming opposing force, the fledgling country defeated its attackers. Since that time, Israel has been buffeted by harassment and violence in varying degrees of intensity. In each attack, whether by neighboring states or terrorist groups, Israel has admirably safeguarded its people and defended its borders.

While Israel has long worked to protect its people, Palestinian Arabs have only recently shown a willingness to dismantle terrorist networks and confiscate illegal weapons. Unfortunately, whether through complete duplicity or half-hearted enforcement of their commitments, terrorist attacks against Israelis continue. Regrettably, there is no sign of any serious effort on the part of the Palestinian Authority to take any action against terrorists.

Since September 2000, Palestinian terrorists have launched more than 18,000 attacks, killing more than 800 Israelis and wounding 5,600. Such a high number of attacks seem inconsistent with the Palestinian Authority's

commitment under the Oslo Accords and Road Map to curb terrorist activities. Without a true partner in peace, Israel alone has been left to defend itself.

One of the best methods of protecting the citizens of Israel is the security fence. In the last three years, not one of the 122 homicide bombers that killed 454 people in Israel infiltrated from Gaza. Gaza is separated from Israel by a security fence.

Despite the proven effectiveness of the Gaza security fence, Israel's recent decision to build a similar security fence around the West Bank has been roundly criticized. In an effort to halt the construction of the fence, a suit has been filed in the International Court of Justice. This case is unprecedented in the history of the court. The court was set up to adjudicate international disputes between two members of the United Nations. In this case, the dispute is not between two U.N. members—the Palestinian Authority is not a member of the United States. The actual U.N. member involved, Israel, has not agreed to the hearing.

This case falls squarely within Israel's domestic jurisdiction which demands that the government protect its citizens. Highlighting this necessity was the bombing of a Jerusalem bus that killed 8 and injured 60. This homicide bombing occurred just before the International Court began hearing the case against the fence. The need for additional security and the need for the fence has never been more clear.

Opponents argue that the fence poses undue hardship to Palestinian Arabs by limiting their employment opportunities or separating them from other Arabs and each other. Certainly, the fence poses a hardship to Palestinian Arabs. The extra security will undoubtedly cause difficulties when moving from the West Bank into Israel but the Israeli government has done its best to be as accommodating as possible. In most places, the fence follows the pre-1967 border. Israel has provided passageways for Palestinian Arab farmers to tend their fields, replanted trees uprooted by fence construction, and protected a water reservoir used by West Bank farmers. In recent days, Israel has shortened the fence citing among its considerations the impact on Palestinian Arabs living near the fence.

As obliging as Israel has been in constructing the security fence, Israel should never be forced to sacrifice its security for convenience. Palestinian Arabs tired of Israel's security measures need only demand that their leaders live up to their commitments to rein in terrorist groups based in the West Bank and Gaza.

It is unfortunate that opponents denounce Israel for protecting itself while ignoring the terrorist attacks that precipitated the need for the fence. At \$1.6 million per mile, I am sure that Israel would prefer to spend its money elsewhere. Unfortunately, the current level of terrorist activity precludes Israel from doing that.

Israel does not wish harm upon its neighbors. Since its establishment, it has only wished to live in peace. Regrettably, Israel's neighbors have never shared this vision. Relentless attacks have forced the Israelis to take steps that seem punitive but only serve to defend the State of Israel and its citizens.

I applaud Israel's security measures. Israel simply has done what the United States of America does everyday, which is protect its